DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 203 479 EA 013 668

AUTHOR	White, Martha; Bonney, Nancy
TITLE	Community Based Education Activities in Southeastern Region Teacher Corps Projects.
INSTITUTION	Georgia Univ., Athens. Southeastern Teacher Corps Recruitment and Community Technical Resource Center.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Education (ED), Washington, D.C. Teacher Corps.
PUB DATE	Aug 80
CONTRACT	300-79-0311
NOTE	78p.
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Advisory Committees; Citizen Participation; Citizens Councils; *Community Involvement; Community Programs; Elections; Elementary Secondary Education; Organizational Effectiveness; Questionnaires; Surveys
IDENTIFIERS	Community Based Education; *Teacher Corps; United States (Southeast)

ABSTRACT

To gather information on the community councils mandated for each Teacher Corps project, this pilot study surveyed 34 project directors and council chairpersons in 24 southeastern projects initiated in 1978 and 1979. The study's questionnaires asked about community council elections, membership, training, leadership, meetings, procedures, interest levels, project involvement, and relationships with the community and the project's policy board. Results showed that all community councils were chosen in community-wide elections, that their members were mostly women and parents, and that they all had standard operating procedures and some involvement in project governance. They also shared similar problems involving council members' attendance, interest, and understanding of the council's role. Those councils started in 1979, however, had consistently higher levels of project and community involvement, council member attendance, and communication with the project policy board than did councils started in 1978. The explanation of these differences may lie in the 1979 councils' earlier elections and training and their use of associate members for broader community representation. (RW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

EA 013 668

TEACHER CORPS

COMMUNITY BASED EDUCATION ACTIVITIES IN SOUTHEASTERN REGION TEACHER CORPS PROJECTS

BY

MARTHA WHITE

NANCY BONNEY

WITH

JEANIE CROSBY

PUBLISHED BY

SOUTHEASTERN RECRUITMENT AND COMMUNITY TECHNICAL RESOURCE CENTER

TEACHER CORPS

UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA, ATHENS, GEORGIA

AUGUST, 1980

LAYOUT AND PRODUCTION BY: SHERYLE BISHOP
SHIRLEY CAREY
MONTYE ESCOE

This publication was prepared pursuant to contract 300 79 0311, the Recruitment and Community Technical Resource Center at University of Georgia, Athens, Georgia, with Teacher Corps, Department of Education. Contractors undertaking such projects under government sponsorship are encouraged to freely express their judgement in professional and technical matters. Points of view or opinions do not, therefore, necessarily represent official Department of Education position or policy.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

iv	FOREWORD	
1	CHAPTER ONE	- Introduction and Purpose
5	CHAPTER TWO	- Review of the Literature
8	CHAPTER THREE	- Population, Methods, and Procedures
13	CHAPTER FOUR	- Limitations of the Study
17	CHAPTER FIVE	- Results and Discussion
55	CHAPTER SIX	- Summary of Results and Implications
61	APPENDIX	- Sample of Questionnaires

FOREWORD

Teacher Corps community councils are dynamic, changing organizations. Each council is unique, yet there are certain elements that are common to all. The Southeastern RCTR Center staff has been intimately involved with these councils through their conception, birth, and development.

Long before the first councils were elected in the fall of 1978, we at the Southeastern Center, (in collaboration with the Teacher Corps National Office, other RCTR Centers, and consultants) were involved in the development of strategies that would help councils become effective, viable partners in Teacher Corps projects. We worked with projects in planning council elections and worked with newly elected councils to help them understand their role. We served as trouble-shooters and problem-solvers for councils that were struggling with the complexities that are inherent in a collaborative venture. As councils became more sophisticated, we developed and delivered training to meet these new needs.

As a result of our extensive experience with Southeastern project community council chairpersons, council members, and project staff, we developed an intuitive sense of what was really happening with councils. There seemed to be certain factors that enhanced council development and effectiveness; there were also certain problems that most all councils seemed to be facing. We began to wonder if these various factors could be documented so that other councils -- both new and old -- could utilize these learnings in their development. Thus, the idea for conducting a survey of Southeastern project councils was born. If we could obtain

information directly from those project persons who had been the most intimately involved with councils, we could describe what has actually happened in Southeastern project community councils, whether positive or negative. This descriptive information would then be available to serve as a basis for determining the factors that enhance -- or inhibit -- council development.

As our excitement grew regarding the possible uses for such a survey, we consulted with the Teacher Corps National Office about the feasibility of such a study. The Teacher Corps National Office was most receptive, supportive, and enthusiastic about the survey. They desired concrete information about councils to aid them in their planning for support to councils. Therefore, they agreed that we should conduct a pilot study of Southeastern project councils to determine the efficacy of such a survey on a national level. The Teacher Corps National Office staff and other RCTR Center personnel provided valuable input into the development of the survey instruments.

While actually conducting the survey, we were extremely gratified by the cooperation of the directors and chairpersons who participated. Given the demands these persons face with many project responsibilities, it would have been easy to disregard the request to complete the pilot survey. However, the majority of participants not only completed the questionnaires, but also provided additional information about council activities. This information provided valuable insight into the development of community councils. We gratefully acknowledge these directors' and chairpersons' cooperation and willingness to share their time, information, and ideas.

This publication provides a comprehensive report of the community council pilot survey, including background information, methods and procedures, and results and implications. The format -- in modified research style -- not only conveys the most important finding, but also provides a basis for further research. We feel that valuable information is contained within this report and hope that the report will serve as a catalyst for further exploration into the dynamic world of community councils.

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION AND PURPOSE

The Teacher Corps is a federally funded program designed to improve the educational opportunities of children in low-income areas through improving the training and retraining programs for teachers. Since its origin in 1966, Teacher Corps has promoted collaboration among school districts, colleges/universities, and communities to achieve this goal. To strengthen the opportunity for community involvement in the educational decision-making process, the 1976 Teacher Corps legislation mandated that each Teacher Corps project have an elected community council. The community, through the council, was to become an equal partner with the local education agency (LEA) and the institution of higher education (IHE) in all project decisions and activities (Carrillo, Bonney, & White, 1979).

Teacher Corps did not originate the idea of community involvement in the educational process. Since the origin of public schools in America in 1642, schools have been designed to be responsive to community needs. However, as public education became more formalized, schools often were viewed primarily as academic centers for youth, with little relevance to the broader community. It has only been in the latter half of the twentieth century that community based education began making a resurgence (Powell & Winecoff, 1979, pp. 25-34).

The unrest of communities during the 1960's forced the federal government to recognize and respond to the cry for citizen participation and involvement, not only in education, but in other areas as well. In 1968, with the passage of the Educational Professions Development Act, the Office of Education began encouraging, and then mandating, citizen participation in federal programs. Since 1971, all new legislation dealing with elementary and secondary education has required a community

advisory council. The Teacher Corps program was no exception (Davies, 1979).

In the earliest years of the Teacher Corps program, community involvement was informal. Teacher-interns were encouraged to learn about the project communities and to develop activities for the community; there was no legitimate vehicle for the community to be involved in project decisions, however. In the early 1970's, each Teacher Corps project was requested to select a school/community council composed of teachers, school administrators, parents, and other community residents. However, neither the method of selection nor the exact role of the council was specified, and the involvement of these school/community councils varied greatly among projects (Carrillo et al., 1979).

The 1976 Teacher Corps legislation left no doubt about the method of selection nor the role of the community council in a project. Each project was mandated to elect a community council in a community-wide election. The chairperson of the council was to serve on the project policy board (the primary governance structure of the project) as an equal partner with the dean of the institution of higher education and the superintendent of the local education agency. The council was thus mandated to achieve a parity role in the planning, implementation, and evaluation of the Teacher Corps project. The new legislation greatly strengthened the role of the community. Dr. William L. Smith, the former national director of the Teacher Corps program, emphasized the community's new role in a speech at the 1978 National Teacher Corps Conference:

> The community has historically been one of the weakest links in the Teacher Corps chain. Now, however, the community is by law an integral part of each local project. The place of the community in each local project must be legitimized and used to benefit all partners in the Teacher Corps endeavor.

In July 1978, with the funding of eighty-one Program '78 projects, Teacher Corps began a new phase of council activity and community involvement. To assist the new councils in obtaining parity with two highly established institutions, the National Teacher Corps Office contracted four regional Recruitment and Community Technical Resource Centers (RCTR's) to provide technical assistance to projects in the election, organization, and maintenance of effective councils.

In addition to the eighty-one projects funded in 1978, fifty-three additional projects were notified of funding in the spring of 1979 and were funded in July, 1979. The RCTR Centers have worked closely with numerous councils in both Program '78 and Program '79 projects. It is apparent that projects and councils have met with varying degrees of success in attempting to carry out the goals of the new Teacher Corps legislation. Have the goals of collaboration and parity been achieved? Have community councils been able to establish themselves as equal partners in the educational process?

The purpose of this pilot study was to obtain data which would assist in answering these questions as well as in describing the activities and involvement of community councils in the 27 projects in the Southeastern region. The complexity and diversity of issues among the 134 community councils across the country is great. It was felt, therefore, that it would be difficult, if not impossible, to provide a comprehensive analysis of all aspects of council involvement in all parts of the country in one initial investigation. As a result, it was determined that a pilot study would be conducted in the Southeastern region. A pilot was felt to be appropriate since it could accomplish three major objectives:

1) Provide a sample of the levels of council involvement, types of council involvement and activities, and the factors effecting council development. This information would be helpful in structuring future investigations.

2) Indicate specific areas, trends, and/or problems in council development that should be studied further.

3) Serve as a model for future community council surveys. This pilot survey demonstrates a method of gathering council information which could be implemented nationally.

The purpose of this study is not to provide a definitive description of council activities across the country, nor even in the Southeast. However, it is hoped that the information obtained will serve a three-fold purpose:

1) To provide projects and councils with information about what has occurred in other projects -- information about effective practices, as well as pitfalls to avoid;

2) To provide the Southeastern RCTR Center with information about Southeastern projects' council development, activities, and needs that will enable future support contracts to provide more appropriate and effective technical assistance;

3) To provide the national Teacher Corps office with information that will enhance the planning of future legislation and of support services effecting the community.

CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

A review of the literature indicates that community involvement has indeed been on the upsurge in the last decade. Powell and Winecoff (1979) indicate seven characteristics that reflect the trend toward active, positive, public involvement in the educational decision-making process. These characteristics include:

1. Mandated public school advisory councils in many states (California, Florida, and South Carolina).

2. Strengthened Title I advisory councils at the local school and district levels with provisions for training.

3. The rapid spread of the community education/community school movement... from several hundred isolated schools to thousands of schools throughout the country - each with a community school council.

4. The spread of community education at:
   a. State Departments of Education: from a handful to well over forty.
   b. Institutions of higher education: from a half dozen to almost a hundred.

5. The passage of community education legislation, (encouraging or, in most cases, mandating advisory councils).

6. The development of a strong community component within many local and federal programs such as Teacher Corps, ESAA (Emergency School Assistance Act), Parent Education, Adult Education, Recreation.

7. The adoption of resolutions supporting community education by entities such as the National Congress of Parents and Teachers, the National Chamber of Commerce, the National Jaycees, the Education Commission of the states, and many others (pp. 33-34).

The huge upsurge in federal and state mandated community activities has not, however, automatically insured true parity for the community, as Davies (1978) indicated in a report on a study completed by the Institute for Responsive Education, The Federal and State Impact on Citizen Parti-

cipation. The study indicated that in 1978 there were approximately 100,000 community advisory councils in existence, with perhaps 1,300,000 members across the country. Of those 100,000 councils, however, only a very few represented "any genuine effort to share power, to involve community people in a real way in making decisions" (p.81).

Similar findings were reported by Aquino (1975) in his review of the literature on community involvement in education. The degree and type of citizen participation and council involvement in programs such as Title I, Model Cities, and Education Professions Development Act vary as much as the programs themselves. The purpose, role, and function of advisory councils in these programs differ dramatically from the recently mandated Teacher Corps councils. Thus, the majority of these studies provide minimal relevant data for Teacher Corps councils.

There are at least two studies which report on community council models which were forerunners of the current Teacher Corps model of council involvement. The first study, School-Community Council Governance (Winecoff, Powell & Lyday, 1977), reports case studies of school-community councils in nine Southeastern Teacher Corps projects prior to the new legislation. The second study, Involvement: A Study of Shared Governance of Teacher Education (Joyce, 1978), reports on the findings of the Urban/Rural School Development Program.

The report on the earlier Teacher Corps school-community councils indicates a great diversity among councils in regard to method of selection of members, composition, representation, council procedures and activites, and council role in the project. It appears that the primary role of the school-community council was to inform the community of project activities. There is also some evidence to indicate the increase of community

support in projects with school-community councils. However, there is little indication that provisions were made for community involvement in project governance procedures (Winecoff et al., 1977).

In the Urban/Rural School Development Program, the school-community council was the core of the project. Similar to Teacher Corps in its overall goals, the Urban/Rural Program was designed to improve education in low income communities, with a strong emphasis on parity and collaboration. A summary of the Urban/Rural learnings for councils is as follows (Davies, 1979):

- Projects in which the parity concept was well-developed were more effective than projects in which parity was poorly developed.
- At least six to twelve months are required to develop an effective council in which status difference and conflicts are resolved.
- Broad representation is crucial to council development and effectiveness.
- Council members need training in both human relations processes and in group processes.

Since Urban/Rural councils were similar in purpose and philosophy to the Teacher Corps model, it might be assumed that Teacher Corps councils will experience similar developmental stages, face similar problems, achieve similar successes. However, because of the relative newness of Teacher Corps councils, there is currently no research to substantiate this assumption. It is hoped that the data obtained in this pilot study will not only begin to fill this void, but will also identify further areas for research.

CHAPTER THREE

POPULATION, METHODS, AND PROCEDURES

POPULATION

There are currently 134 Teacher Corps projects located throughout the country. Of these 134 projects, 27 are located within the eleven Southeastern states served by the Southeastern RCTR Center. The 27 projects in the Southeastern region represent diverse populations and settings. The Southeastern region stretches from Maryland to Florida and extends westward to include Kentucky, Tennessee, and Mississippi. While the majority of projects are located in rural areas, there are a number of projects in urban and suburban settings. Of the 27 projects, 17 were funded in the summer of 1978, and 10 were funded during the spring of 1979. (At the time this survey was conducted, Program '78 councils, elected in the fall of 1978, had been in operation an average of 20 months; Program '79 councils, elected in the spring of 1979, had averaged 12 months of operation.)

While there is great diversity among projects in terms of specific goals and activities, all have been funded for a five year period and have been designed to achieve the following four basic outcomes of Teacher Corps, as specified in the HEW Teacher Corps "Regulations" in the Federal Register (Feb. 23, 1978):

1. Improved School Climate
2. Improved Personnel Development System
3. Continuation of Educational Improvements
4. Adoption/Adaptation of Educational Improvements

Under Teacher Corps regulations, the elected community council of each project is to serve in a parity relationship with the IHE and LEA

in the planning, implementation, and evaluation of project activities to achieve these four basic outcomes. The council is also expected to play a major role in the development of community based education activities, another project element specified in the regulations.

PROCEDURES

Development of the Instrument. In order to obtain data regarding community council and community based education activities in the Southeastern Teacher Corps projects, the staff of the Southeastern RCTR Center decided to survey the director and community council chairperson of each project in the region through the use of a written questionnaire. It was decided that the survey would include three major sets of questions: questions to be responded to by directors only; questions to be responded to by chairpersons only; and questions to be responded to by both directors and chairpersons. Thus, two individual two-part questionnaires were developed — a director's questionnaire and a chairperson's questionnaire. The second parts of each questionnaire were identical and were designed to solicit directors' and chairpersons' perceptions of council activities in three major areas: council activities and involvement in project operations; factors in council development; and community involvement. However, the first parts of each questionnaire were designed to solicit specific information from either the chairperson or the director. The first part of the chairperson's questionnaire focused on council membership and council operations; the first part of the director's questionnaire focused on council election procedures and policy board information.

The specific items included in the questionnaires were developed as a result of Southeastern RCTR staff members' experience with projects and

councils during project site visits and regional training conferences. Format and content suggestions were derived, in part, from an assessment instrument used by local projects, Looking at Teacher Corps Community Council Functions (Bonney and Crosby, 1979). Personnel from projects, other RCTR Centers, and the National Teacher Corps Office were consulted for suggestions regarding the content and format. (A copy of the two questionnaires are included in the appendix along with the accompanying cover letter.)

Distribution Procedures. As soon as the national Teacher Corps office had given final approval to the pilot survey instruments, the appropriate questionnaire (coded for identification and follow-up procedures) was sent to each of the directors and chairpersons of 26 of the 27 projects in the Southeast. (At the time of mailing, one of the ten Program '79 projects was not operational.) A cover letter was sent with each questionnaire. The cover letter included the purpose of the survey and instructions for respondents to return the completed questionnaire to the Southeastern RCTR Center within two weeks. The prospective respondents were assured of anonymity. They were also assured that the questionnaire was to be used as an aid in describing council activities and was not intended to be an evaluation instrument. After two weeks, respondents who had not returned the questionnaire were mailed a second copy and asked to return it within a week.

Because of the relatively small number of projects being surveyed, it was anticipated that at least one completed questionnaire would be returned from each project. However, it was felt that a relatively accurate description of council activities could be derived with a 70% return rate (questionnaires received from 18 chairpersons and 18 directors).

Return Rate and Respondents. Of the 52 persons who were mailed questionnaires, 34 (22 directors, 12 chairpersons) returned the completed form, a 66% return rate. Although a 70% return rate had been projected, it is felt that the results are relatively representative of Southeastern projects since at least one questionnaire was received from 92% of the projects.

TABLE 1 - RETURN RATE OF RESPONDENTS

	NUMBER OF FORMS MAILED OUT			NUMBER OF FORMS RETURNED			PERCENTAGE RETURNED		
	Dir.	Chair.	All	Dir.	Chair.	All	Dir.	Chair.	All
Program '78	17	17	34	14	5	19	83%	30%	56%
Program '79	9	9	18	8	7	15	89%	78%	84%
ALL	26	26	52	22	12	34	85%	47%	66%

Table 1 depicts the total return rate and the return rates of role groups and of same year projects. The overall return rate was significantly lowered by the surprisingly low 30% return rate of Program '78 chairpersons. In contrast, Program '79 chairpersons and directors, and Program '78 directors had a return rate of 79% or greater.

Analysis Procedures. For analysis purposes, the respondents were classified (by role and project year) into four subgroups: (1) Program '78 directors; (2) Program '79 directors; (3) Program '78 Chairpersons; (4) Program '79 Chairpersons. Under this classification system, individual responses to each item were tabulated, and percentage subtotals were computed for each subgroup. This four-fold classification system allowed the results to be analysed from several perspectives: each subgroup

could be viewed as a discreet population; responses of each subgroup could be compared to determine differences in perceptions between different year project personnel and/or between different role groups; responses of each subgroup could be combined to give the overall results of the total respondent group. Figure 1 illustrates a way of looking at these different perspectives and represents the format that was used in the tables to present the results. In the actual analysis of the data, the choice of a particular perspective or a combination of perspectives was determined by the type of information being solicited in a particular section of the questionnaire.

FIGURE 1

Percent of '78 Directors	Percent of '78 Chairpersons	Percent of All '78 Personnel
Percent of '79 Directors	Percent of '79 Chairpersons	Percent of All '79 Personnel
Percent of All Directors	Percent of All Chairpersons	Percent of All Respondents

The purpose of the study was to provide a general description of the types of council activities and levels of council involvement in Southeastern projects. It is felt that the analysis procedures that were utilized provided such a description and that more complex statistical procedures were neither necessary nor desirable. As a pilot, the study was intended to identify areas for future research. If, at that time, more definitive information is desired, a more sophisticated research design, with appropriate statistical procedures, can be employed.

CHAPTER FOUR

LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

There are certain limitations inherent in the nature of questionnaires. The results of the survey are totally dependent on the willingness of the respondents to complete the questionnaire. Even if all the questionnaires are returned, there is no assurance that items were answered accurately or honestly. There is also no way to assess the built-in biases of respondents. Project personnel may have perceived the questionnaire as an evaluation instrument and may have been tempted to adjust their answers to reflect a more positive situation than actually exists. On the other hand, respondents who have been frustrated by persons or "the system", may have seen the questionnaire as an appropriate means of venting these frustrations.

Another limitation inherent in the structure of questionnaires is the possibility of misinterpretation of the questions. Though care was taken to remove ambiguity from items, it is possible that responses to specific items were influenced by the subjective item interpretation of respondents. Misinterpretation of responses is also always a possibility in analyzing completed questionnaires, particularly with regard to open-ended questions.

The study is also limited in that data was obtained from only two persons from each project. While it is recognized that the chairperson and the director have the primary access to key concerns regarding the council, the study would have probably yielded more convincing data if other project personnel, council members, and community members were questioned.

Another concern is that the questionnaire, by its very nature, does not lend itself to an in-depth study of specific council activities. Though the results provide other projects with suggestions for council activities, they do not provide details of how to accomplish a specific goal or activity.

The results of the survey were based on an N of 34 respondents or 66% of the total population that was being surveyed, indicating that the results are fairly representative of Southeastern projects. However, the unequal response rate by the subgroups of respondents imposes a somewhat serious limitation on the interpretation of at least a portion of the results. Ideally, for the study to have revealed data that was truly representative of council activities in all Southeastern projects, a 100% return rate from all respondents would have been required. Realistically, it was felt that if the response rate for each subgroup approached 70%, a representative sample would be obtained. The equally high return rates of three of the subgroups suggest that portions of the results are representative. The responses of the total group of directors are based on an 85% return rate, thus revealing an accurate representation of Southeastern directors' perceptions regarding the level of council involvement. The results relating to Program '79 projects are based on an 84% combined return rate for Program '79 directors and chairpersons. Unfortunately, the information relating to Program '78 projects is not as representative, since there was only a 30% return rate by Program '78 chairpersons. This low return rate also skews the data relating to both the total group of chairpersons, and to comparisons between Program '78 and Program '79 chairpersons.

Another problem in interpreting the data is due to the fact that

there are almost twice as many Program '78 projects as Program '79 Projects located in the Southeast. It was felt that reporting the results in term of percentage of respondents would minimize the possible distortion of the results that could be caused by the large number of Program '78 projects. Nevertheless, certain problems in interpretation still exist. For example, Program '79 directors had an 89% return rate compared to an 83% return rate for Program '78 directors. Yet of the 34 questionnaires that were analyzed, 14 were from Program '78 directors compared to only 8 from Program '79 directors. Thus, the responses of the total group of directors is more reflective of Program '78 directors responses than Program '79 directors, even though the percentage rate is lower. The larger number of Program '78 projects, coupled with the high response rate of directors, means that Program '78 project directors had significantly more impact on the overall results. Since 41% of all questionnaires received are from one subgroup -- Program '78 directors -- when council activities and involvement are described from the perspective of the total group of respondents, this description is skewed toward the perceptions of Program '78 directors.

Program '78 and Program '79 directors comprise 65% of the total sample population of 34 respondents. Therefore, the overall description of Southeastern councils is influenced more by the perceptions of directors than of chairpersons. Since 56% of the questionnaires received were from Program '78 respondents and 44% were from Program '79 respondents, the overall description was influenced almost equally by personnel from Program '78 and Program '79 projects.

Although the various limitations of the study prevent any definitive conclusions about all Southeastern councils, it is felt that the

results nevertheless have value. The study does provide information about a sample of councils and also provides insight into the types of activities, problems, and issues that these councils are dealing with. It also identifies some potential patterns relating to these councils that should be researched further.

CHAPTER FIVE

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

INTRODUCTION

The results of the survey, when viewed as a whole, indicate that there are as many differences among Southeastern region community councils as there are similarities. The responses of the sample population of directors and chairpersons represented in the survey indicate that some generalizations can be made, however. All projects conducted some type of council election that resulted in a council composed of parents and non-parents, with the number of members ranging from 7 to 21. All councils have established some sort of standard operating procedures, and most have received some training. Each council has a chairperson who serves on the project policy board, but policy board membership varies greatly among projects. All councils have had some degree of involvement in project operations and in conducting special projects or activities. There are numerous factors and/or problems that have impinged on council development, but these factors vary among projects. The degree of council and community involvement also varies greatly among projects.

While these generalizations provide a broad overview of the status of community councils in Southeastern Teacher Corps projects, more definitive information comes only when looking at the responses to specific questions asked in the survey. Analysis of individual questions/items reveals more specific types of information and also illustrates the differences in the responses of the four subgroups surveyed. There are significant* differences between the responses of chairpersons

and directors, as well as between Program '78 and Program '79 project personnel. Analysis of individual survey items is necessary if a true picture of the similarities and differences among respondents' perceptions of council operations and involvement is to be portrayed.

As noted earlier, the original survey utilized two different questionnaires -- the "Directors' Community Council Questionnaire" and the "Chairpersons' Community Council Questionnaire." The questionnaires were identical except for the first two sections of each. In the director's questionnaire, Section I solicited information about council election procedures; Section II focused on policy board information. In the chairperson's questionnaire, Section I and II focused on council membership and council operations. In both questionnaires, Sections III, IV, and V solicited information on council activities and involvement. To facilitate discussion of the survey, the results will be presented in three parts:

PART ONE - DIRECTOR'S QUESTIONNAIRE - SECTIONS I and II

PART TWO - CHAIRPERSON'S QUESTIONNAIRE - SECTIONS I and II

PART THREE - DIRECTOR'S AND CHAIRPERSON'S QUESTIONNAIRES - SECTIONS III, IV, and V.

For most questions the results will be presented by use of tables which indicate the percentage response rates of each of the four subgroups, the subtotal responses of same role groups and same-year personnel, and the total response percentages of the entire group of respondents. Each

*[Note: The use of the term "significant" in this report is not based on [illegible] statistical procedures. The use of the term reflects the author's judgment that there are noteworthy differences among response rates. In most cases, this is at least a 20% difference.]

table will be supplemented by a brief narrative summary of the results it depicts. Because of the complex design of the five-part survey and the diversity of the questions, interpretations and/or implications will be discussed in conjunction with the presentation of the results rather than in a separate section of the report.

PART ONE - DIRECTOR'S QUESTIONNAIRE - SECTIONS I & II

Section I - Community Council Election Data

Questions regarding the community council election were directed to project directors only. It was assumed that most council chairpersons were not involved with the project until after the election, and thus would not have access to the information. The directors were asked questions regarding the method of election, the election planning process, and voter turn out.

TABLE 2

METHOD OF COMMUNITY COUNCIL ELECTION

		MAIL BALLOT	POLLING PLACE	CONVEN-TION	OTHER
N=14	% of '78 Directors	8%	65%	28%	9%
N=8	% of '79 Directors	38%	63%	0%	0%
N=22	% of all Directors	19%	64%	15%	8%

As Table 2 indicates, a higher percentage of respondents used the polling place method than all other methods combined. The polling place method was used most frequently by both Program '78 and Program '79 projects. Almost one third of the Program '78 projects used the convention method; approximately one fifth used either the mail ballot or some other procedure. In contrast, Program '79 projects conducted polling place elections (63%) and mail ballot elections (38%) exclusively. Though the respondents did not indicate the reasons why a particular method was chosen, it is possible that Program '79 project personnel learned from Program '78 projects that the convention method was not particularly effective, especially in rural areas.

TABLE 3

PLANNING FOR COUNCIL ELECTION

	Planned by:	PROJECT STAFF	PROJECT APPOINTED COMMITTEE	TEMP. COUNCIL	POLICY BOARD	COMBIN.
N=14	% of '78 Dir.	15%	36%	22%	0%	50%
N=8	% of '79 Dir.	38%	38%	38%	0%	38%
N=22	% of All Dir.	27%	37%	30%	0%	44%

Directors responses indicated that planning for the election was a collaborative process, with a variety of groups involved in the planning process. Almost half of the respondents indicated that a combination of groups (project staff, temporary council, project appointed committee) was responsible for the planning. Somewhat surprisingly, none of the respondents indicated that the policy board had a role in planning the election. One reason for this may be the fact that since the council election was conducted soon after initial project funding, the policy board may not have been operational at the time the election was planned.

TABLE 4

VOTER TURN OUT

		VERY LIGHT	LIGHT	AVE.	ABOVE AVE.	HIGH
N=14	% of '78 Dir.	22%	8%	43%	8%	22%
N=8	% of '79 Dir.	38%	25%	25%	12%	0%
N=22	% of all Dir.	28%	14%	37%	9%	14%

More than 75% of the total group of respondents reported that the voter turn out for the community council election was average or below average with regard to community voting habits. However, 73% of the Program '78 projects reported an average or above average turn out; only 37% of the Program '79 projects reported that the turn out was average or above. This may be the result of the longer time period that Program '78 projects had for planning. Program '78 projects were funded in the early summer of 1978 and had until October 31, 1978, to conduct the election. During this period, they received extensive information and training about election procedures at the 1978 Teacher Corps National Conference and from individual site visits by Southeastern RCTR Center staff. Program '79 projects were notified of funding in the spring of 1979 and were required to have conducted the election by June, 1979. They received little formal technical assistance from the RCTR Centers and had less time for planning and publicizing council elections. Although moving the election date up insured that the council was involved in project operations much sooner, it seems that it also affected voter turn out and perhaps the true representativeness of the council.

An additional community-wide election had been held by 58% of the Program '78 project directors that responded. In contrast, none of the Program '79 projects (in operation for a year or less) had conducted elections since the original one was held. Program '78 Directors indicated three reasons for conducting a second election: (1) filling the expired terms of members; (2) replacing members who were no longer serving; (3) expanding the original membership. There was no data obtained regarding the reasons members needed to be replaced or why the council membership needed to be expanded. Since a high attrition rate obviously

impinges on effectiveness of the council, this information would be interesting for future study.

Section II - Policy Board Data

Since the council chairperson's role on the policy board is considered an important factor in council effectiveness, specific questions relating to the policy board were included in the director's questionnaire. The Teacher Corps regulations require that a project be governed by a policy board (composed of the dean of the College of Education, the superintendent of the local school district, and the chairperson of the community council) to insure that each Teacher Corps project is operated as a collaborative, equal partnership. The regulations also stipulate that these three voting members can agree to expand the membership of the policy board. The data obtained from directors regarding policy board membership indicates that, as a result of expansion, the composition and configurations of policy board membership vary dramatically among projects. Over half of the total group of respondents indicated that their projects were governed by an expanded policy board, with the majority of these being Program '78 projects.

Of the 14 Program '78 projects represented in the survey, 71% have expanded their policy board membership. In contrast, only 25% of the eight Program '79 projects have more than the three mandated members. Among reporting Program '78 projects, the number of voting members ranges from 3 to 11, with 50% of these policy boards having at least six members. Only three projects had added an additional representative from the community, the university, the interns, or the state education association. However, over half of the projects' expanded policy boards included

additional representatives from the LEA -- principals, teachers, and/or others. Many of the expanded policy boards do not reflect parity representation since one of the three partners (usually the LEA) often has more representatives than the other two.

Among the eight Program '79 projects, voting membership ranges from three to seven members, with only two projects having more than three members. Of these two, one project's policy board was required to have two deans since there were two universities in the project; the second, a youth advocacy project, was required to have representatives from the juvenile justice institutions on the policy board. Thus, the only two "expanded" policy boards among Program '79 projects were the result of unique project characteristics. None of the more typical Program '79 projects chose to expand the policy board membership, a significant change from Program '78 projects.

Non-voting membership on policy boards was similar between Program '78 and Program '79 projects. All respondents indicated at least one non-voting member (the project director), with the majority indicating three to five additional members. Roles represented by those non-voting members were diverse, ranging from project staff members to central office representatives. It is difficult to draw conclusions from this information, however. Since "non-voting membership" was not defined in the questionnaire, there is no information regarding the non-voting members' role, attendance rate, or degree of participation.

The data relating to policy board meetings also indicates a difference between Program '78 and Program '79 projects. Although more than half of the <u>total</u> number of respondents indicated that the policy board was scheduled to meet monthly, 75% of the Program '79 projects scheduled

monthly policy board meetings compared to only 50% of Program '78. The average number of policy board meetings actually held by Program '79 projects during their 12-month period of operation is eight; the average number of policy board meetings actually held by Program '78 projects during their 24-months of operation is twelve. Thus, though Program '79 projects have been in existence only half as long as Program '78 projects, they have already held two-thirds as many policy board meetings. There is a possibility that the first year of the project (the planning year) may require more meetings than subsequent years, but there is no data to substantiate this. Both Program '78 and Program '79 project respondents indicated that the main reasons policy board meetings were not held as originally scheduled were scheduling conflicts and/or the unavailability of the dean, chairperson, or superintendent.

The data on policy board membership and meetings indicates that there are significant differences regarding policy board operations between Program '78 and Program '79 projects. Although there is no hard data to suggest the reasons for these differences, it is possible to speculate. Program '78 projects were originally encouraged to expand their policy boards to insure representation from all the various constituencies. When they did so, however, the concept of parity -- equal representation of all three partners -- was often diluted. With additonal members, scheduling meetings may have become more difficult; as a result, the Program '78 projects did not meet as often as scheduled. In the interim between meetings, decisions may have had to be made and implemented by individual project personnel, thus diluting the policy board's effectiveness as the project's primary policy/decision-maker. If this is the case, then perhaps Program '79 projects profited from the learnings of

Program '78 projects and purposely limited the size and compostion of the policy board. Research into the factors relating to the effectiveness of the policy board may be desirable since the policy board's role is considered crucial to successful project operation.

PART TWO - CHAIRPERSON'S QUESTIONNAIRE - SECTIONS I & II

The first two sections of the chairperson's questionnaire focused on information regarding council membership and council operations. It was felt that the chairpersons, most of whom had served in that role from one to two years, would have greater access to the requested information than the project director. The information presented in this section is based on data obtained from questionnaires from seven of the nine (78%) Program '79 project chairpersons in the Southeastern region, and from five of the seventeen (30%) Program '78 project chairpersons in the region. Thus, the information regarding Program '79 councils is representative of all Southeastern '79 projects; the information about Program '78 councils is not as representative of the Program '78 projects in the Southeast.

The low return rate of the Program '78 chairpersons, compared with the 75% or greater return rate of the other three subgroups, has implications regarding the status of councils in projects. Since the same distribution procedures and instructions, as well as updated addresses, were utilized with all prospective respondents, there is no clear reason for Program '78 chairpersons' minimal response rate. However, there is cause for speculation, particularly in light of the pattern that evolves from the results.

Program '78 projects were the first Teacher Corps projects to be funded under the legislation requiring elected community councils. Therefore, Program '78 community council chairpersons were testing "unchartered waters." They can be viewed either as "pioneers" or as "guinea pigs," but there is little doubt that as "the first," they faced more challenges and more problems than Program '79 chairpersons. Perhaps after two years of dealing with project and council complexities, these chairpersons are disillusioned and disinterested. As a result, they had no motivation to complete the questionnaire and return it. Although this interpretation may not be accurate, the low return rate definitely suggests that this issue should be explored further.

Section I Community Council Membership

The chairperson's questionnaire requested information regarding community council composition according to three different categories: gender, race, and role. Table 5 reflects the council membership of the twelve responding projects, both individually and as a whole. The resulting profile indicates that the "composite" council has a total of 13 members. Of these 13 members, there are: 9 women and 4 men; 7 blacks and 6 whites; 9 parents and 4 non-parents; no student or teacher representatives.

There is very little difference in council composition between Program '78 and Program '79 projects. Most councils (75%) have more women than men serving as members; fifty per-cent of the councils have have at least three times as many women members. Most councils (84%) have either predominantly black membership or predominantly white membership

TABLE 5

COMMUNITY COUNCIL COMPOSITION

	TOTAL NO.	WOMEN	MEN	BLACK	WHITE	HISP.	OTHER	PARENTS	NON PARENTS	STUDENTS	TEACHERS
'78 Project a.	10	8	2	2	8	0	0	6	4	0	0
'78 Project b.	15	8	7	5	10	0	0	13	2	0	0
'78 Project c.	12	6	6	3	9	0	0	9	3	0	0
'78 Project d.	20	16	4	12	1	3	3	13	5	1	1
'78 Project e.	13	10	3	2	11	0	0	6	6	1	0
'78 Project Average	16	9	4	5	8	0	0	9	5	0	0
'79 Project a.	14	7	7	12	2	0	0	12	2	0	0
'79 Project b.	13	8	5	13	0	0	0	12	1	0	0
'79 Project c.	9	7	2	5	3	1	0	3	5	0	1
'79 Project d.	15	12	3	5	10	0	0	9	5	0	1
'79 Project e.	14	4	10	12	2	0	0	12	2	0	0
'79 Project f.	12	12	0	3	9	0	0	10	2	0	1
'79 Project g.	7	6	1	3	4	0	0	6	1	0	0
'79 Project Average	12	9	3	7	4	0	0	9	3	0	0
TOTAL Average of '78 and '79 Projects	13	9	4	7	6	0	0	9	4	0	0

-- i.e., at least twice as many members of the predominant race; there is virtually no other ethnic representation on these councils. Most councils (84%) have more parent that non-parent members, with 59% having at least three times as many parents. Only 17% of the councils had a student member, and only 33% of the councils had a teacher serving on the council.

More than half of the total group of chairpersons indicated that their council membership had been expanded since the original election, with four of the Program '78 projects having expanded councils compared to three of the Program '79 councils. Most of those which had expanded did so by using a combination of methods. Most councils expanded through the appointment of associate members and/or another method rather than by increasing the voting membership through a community wide election. The fact that only a small percentage of Program '78 projects indicated additional elections for expansion is in agreement with the data from the directors' questionnaires, which showed only two instances of an additional election to expand membership.

TABLE 6

METHOD OF EXPANDING COUNCIL MEMBERSHIP

		APPOINTMENT ASSOC. MEMBERS	COMMUNITY WIDE ELECTION	BY-LAW REVISION	OTHER
N=4*	% of Expanded '78	78%	33%	0	33%
N=3*	% of Expanded '79	72%	0	0	28%
N=7*	% of ALL Expanded	53%	17%	0	31%

*(Refers only to councils with expanded membership, not total N.)

The projects which indicated inclusion of associate members, drew their associate membership from diverse groups, as Table 7 indicates. There are apparently more Program '79 councils with broad representation than Program '78 councils, particularly in terms of project staff, school adminstrators, and community agencies. However, since respondents had no opportunity to explain their definition of "associate members," or these members' role, it is impossible to know how actively involved they are in routine council operations.

TABLE 7

ASSOCIATE MEMBERSHIP REPRESENTATION

% of Councils having representatives from:		STUDENTS	TEACHERS	INTERNS	PROF. STAFF	SCHOOL ADMIN.	COMMUNITY AGENCIES
N=2*	'78 Councils	20%	40%	20%	0	0	0
N=5*	'79 Councils	15%	43%	29%	86%	58%	43%
N=7*	All Councils	17%	41%	25%	43%	29%	21%

*(Refers only to councils with associate members, not to total N.)

Section II Council Operations

Program '78 and Program '79 projects are generally similar with regard to council meetings and procedures. All respondents indicated that their councils are scheduled to meet monthly. Program '79 projects, which had been in existence for approximately 12 months, reported that their councils had actually met an average of 11 times; Program '78 projects, which have been in existence almost 24 months, reported that

their councils had actually met an average of 18 times. In other words, Program '79 projects have had almost 2/3 as many council meetings as '78 projects in only half the time, which was also the relationship between the frequency of Program '78 and Program '79 policy board meetings reported by directors.

The total group of respondents indicated that more than half of their members are "active" and attend meetings regularly. The Program '79 respondents indicated that 69% of their council members attended regularly and that 74% of their members are active; in comparison, the Program '78 respondents indicated a slightly lower response in both these categories, 58% and 55% respectively. It may be that Program '78 projects, with almost a year longer of council operations, have suffered a greater attrition rate than Program '79 councils, which may still be in their "honeymoon" period.

TABLE 8

COUNCIL OPERATING PROCEDURES

Percentage of Respondents whose councils:	N=5 '78	N=7 '79	N=12 ALL
1. Record and distribute minutes.	100%	72%	84%
2. Have paid secretary or assistant.	80%	43%	59%
3. Approve spending of council budget.	80%	86%	84%
4. Members receive agenda prior to meeting.	20%	100%	50%
5. Operate under written bylaws.	100%	100%	100%

As Table 8 indicates, in regard to operating procedures, Program '78 and Program '79 councils are generally similar. All chairpersons indicated that their councils operate under a written set of by-laws;

the majority indicated that their councils record and distribute minutes and approve spending of the council budget. A significantly higher percentage of Program '78 councils reported they are assisted by a paid secretary. In contrast, a much higher percentage of Program '79 projects reported that agendas are distributed to members prior to meetings. Probably the most important aspect of this information is that the councils represented in the survey do have established procedures that they follow.

As Table 9 indicates, training was a familiar theme to both Program '78 and Program '79 respondents. Only two of the twelve councils reporting had received no training. The majority of councils had received between one and five training sessions, with the cost of training being shared by the council, the project, and/or the Southeastern RCTR Center. Over 90% of the respondents indicated that they received training within the first six months of project operations, perhaps suggesting that training has focused primarily on orientation and organizational strategies. Generally, Program '79 councils received training earlier than Program '78 projects, with 72% reporting training in the first three months, compared to 40% of the '78 projects. This suggests that Program '79 projects may have learned from Program '78 projects the value of early training.

The council training was provided by a variety of persons, including project staff, local consultants, RCTR personnel, or a combination of these groups. Overall, however, Southeastern RCTR Center personnel were involved in 76% of the training sessions, compared to 33% by a local consultant, and 49% by project staff. This fact has implications

TABLE 9

COMMUNITY COUNCIL TRAINING

'78 N=5
'79 N=7
Total N=12

Number of training sessions:

	0	1-3	3-5	6+
'78	20%	20%	40%	20%
'79	15%	58%	15%	0
ALL	17%	39%	28%	10%

Training provided within:

	THREE MONTHS	SIX MONTHS	TWELVE MONTHS	2nd YEAR
'78	40%	60%	0	20%
'79	72%	15%	0	0
ALL	56%	38%	0	10%

Training paid for by funds from:

	COUNCIL BUDGET	PROJECT BUDGET	RCTR	DON'T KNOW
'78	80%	40%	40%	20
'79	15%	43%	43%	0
ALL	42%	42%	42%	9

Training provided by:

	LOCAL COUNCIL	RCTR STAFF	RCTR CONSULT.	PROJECT STAFF
'78	60%	20%	80%	40%
'79	15%	15%	43%	58%
ALL	33%	17%	59%	49%

for the planning of future training events since the RCTR Centers are no longer in operation.

The most frequent training topics, according to respondents, are listed on the following page in order of frequency. (The number to the right of each topic indicates the total number of sessions reported by the twelve chairpersons).

Training Topic	Number of Sessions
Orientation to Teacher Corps and/or project goals	10
Role and function of council	10
Bylaws development	7
Human relations training	7
Meeting skills	5
Needs assessment	2
Planning/goal setting	2

As this information indicates, almost all training sessions related to the functioning of community councils rather than to specific educational issues or content areas. This indicates that it takes an extended period of time for councils to become an organized, cohesive group. However, this phase of council development appears to be necessary before councils can focus on broader, programmatic goals.

PART THREE - DIRECTOR'S AND CHAIRPERSON'S QUESTIONNAIRES - SECTIONS III, IV, & V

Part Three of the community council questionnaire solicited information about council development, activities, and involvement in the project, as well as about community involvement in general. Since these questions were directed to both chairpersons and directors, the data will primarily be viewed from three perspectives: (1) the perspective of the specific role group -- i.e., responses of directors and chairpersons separately; (2) the perspective of project year -- i.e., responses of all '78 personnel in contrast to all '79 personnel; (3) the perspective of the group as a whole.

Section III - Description of Council Activities and Involvement in Project Activities

Section III of the questionnaire provided the respondents, through the use of a three-point scale, an opportunity to indicate the degree of council involvement in various project operations and activities. They were asked to indicate whether a statement was (1) "Not True" of their council, (2) "Somewhat True" of their council, or (3) "Generally True" of their council. The results indicate that, generally, the respondents favored the higher, positive ends of the scale, only marking a statement "Not True" an average of 15% of the time. Since the median rating "Somewhat true," was considered an ambiguous category for respondents, it is as not as reflective of degree of involvement as either extreme. This discussion of results will, therefore, focus on the "Generally True" responses. The following listing depicts, in order, the activities which were most frequently engaged in by councils (as ascertained by the responses for the total group of directors and chairpersons). Over half of all the respondents indicated council involvement in the first seven activities; slightly less than half had been involved in volunteer programs, project committees, or newsletter production.

COUNCIL ACTIVITIES

74% — Needs Assessment(s)

71% — Selection of Interns

71% — Informed of Policy Board Meetings

68% — Identifying Community Resources

65% — Special Projects

53% — Input to Policy Board

53% — Increasing Community Involvement

47% — Volunteer Programs

45% — Representations on Project Committees

45% — Newsletter Production

TABLE 10 - DEGREE OF COUNCIL INVOLVEMENT

Total N=34
'78 Dir. N=14, Chr. N=5
'79 Dir. N= 8, Chr. N=7

		GENERALLY TRUE		
		Dir.	Chair.	ALL
The council provides input to policy board agendas.	'78	43%	40%	42%
	'79	50%	86%	67%
	ALL	46%	67%	55%
The council is well informed of policy board meetings and decisions.	'78	78%	40%	69%
	'79	50%	100%	74%
	ALL	69%	75%	71%
The council has conducted a needs assessment of the community.	'78	58%	60%	58%
	'79	88%	100%	94%
	ALL	69%	84%	74%
The council has representation on various project committees.	'78	29%	20%	27%
	'79	63%	72%	67%
	ALL	41%	50%	45%
The council has had a voice in the selection of project staff and/or interns.	'78	72%	60%	69%
	'79	75%	72%	74%
	ALL	73%	67%	71%

		GENERALLY TRUE		
		Dir.	Chair.	ALL
The council has been involved in identifying community resources for the project.	'78	65%	60%	64%
	'79	88%	58%	74%
	ALL	73%	59%	69%
The council has helped the project establish a volunteer program.	'78	50%	80%	58%
	'79	25%	43%	34%
	ALL	41%	59%	47%
The council has helped to increase community involvement in the schools.	'78	72%	60%	69%
	'79	25%	43%	34%
	ALL	55%	50%	53%
The council has undertaken special projects or activities.	'78	72%	80%	74%
	'79	63%	43%	54%
	ALL	69%	59%	65%
The council has been involved in the production of a council and/or project newsletter.	'78	50%	40%	48%
	'79	38%	43%	40%
	ALL	46%	42%	45%

Table 10 indicates that the perception of degree of council involvement differed among project personnel according to the year of the project's funding, as well as according to role in the project. There was apparently a greater difference in perception between different-year projects than between different role groups. To illustrate this, comparisons between Program '78 and Program '79 chairpersons' responses will be made, followed by a comparison of Program '78 and '79 directors' responses. The discussion will then focus on comparison of all chairpersons' responses with all directors' responses.

The first four questions asked respondents about council involvement in needs assessments and project governance issues -- i.e., input to policy boards, information about policy board meetings, and representation on committees. The percentage of Program '79 chairpersons answering "generally true" to these questions was twice as high as the percentage of Program '78 chairpersons. Perhaps after two years of project operations, Program '78 Chairpersons are disillusioned with the council's role in project governance.

Program '78 and Program '79 chairpersons were in general agreement on the next two questions regarding the selection of interns and the identification of community resources -- activities which usually occur in the first year of the project. The next three questions, which focused on increased community involvement, special projects and activities, and volunteer programs, are more highly developed activities which usually do not occur until the second year of a project. Thus, it is not surprising that a higher percentage of Program '78 chairpersons indicated this was true of their councils. The final question regarding the council's involvement in the production of a project newsletter was

ranked relatively low by all chairpersons (as well as all directors.) A factor here may not be the lack of council involvement but the fact that many projects do not publish a newsletter.

The Program '78 and Program '79 directors were generally in closer agreement than their respective chairpersons, though Program '79 directors had a higher percentage rate of "generally true" responses in six out of ten questions. A significantly (25%+) higher percentage of Program '79 directors responded positively to the questions relating to the council input to policy board, needs assessments, and representation on project committees. A significantly higher (20%+) percentage of Program '78 directors responded positively to the council's involvement in increasing community involvement, conducting special projects, and establishing volunteer programs. Program '78 and Program '79 directors were in general agreement about the council's involvement in selection of interns community resources, and information about policy board meetings.

When the responses of all Program '78 personnel are compared with those of all Program '79 personnel, it is apparent that more Program '79 respondents indicated a higher degree of council involvement. In 6 of the 10 questions, a higher percentage of Program '79 personnel indicated a greater degree of council involvement than Program '78 personnel. (In three of these questions there was at least a 30% greater response.) Program '78 respondents indicated more council involvement in only the last four questions, all of which related to activities which normally take place after the first year of the project (which is a planning rather than an operational year).

Generally speaking, there was not a significant difference regarding perception of council involvement among chairpersons and directors.

However, there appeared to be a tendency for chairpersons to rate council involvement slightly higher than directors, as they did in 6 of 10 questions. From these results, it appears that chairpersons and directors from same-year projects view council involvement similarly. Program '79 directors and chairpersons both rated council involvement higher than their counterparts in Program '78 projects. Thus, one would conclude that Program '79 councils have a higher degree of involvement in project activities than Program '78 councils, except in those activities which normally take place in the second year of a project's life.

Section III B, an open-ended question, asked the respondents to describe the council's major contribution to the project. Most of the respondents included several council contributions and these responses are summarized in Table 11 in three basic categories: Special Projects, Changes in Community, and Role in Project Operations.

As the listing indicates, a number of respondents viewed the council's major contribution in terms of special projects or activities which had successfully enhanced the schools, the community, or both. Included in this category are volunteer programs, community education activities, and parenting programs. Respondents from Program '78 projects included special activities at a much higher rate than Program '79 respondents, probably since they have had one year longer to operate.

Many of the respondents listed less tangible council contributions. These contributions are summarized under "Changes in Community," and most relate to increasing community involvement and awareness, increased communication, and increased awareness and involvement of parents.

A number of the respondents viewed the council's major contributions in regard to its role in the project. They included such things

as support for project activities, involvement in project decision-making (planning, implementation and evaluation), and input to the project through a community needs assessment. It is interesting to note that chairpersons listed more concrete activities as contributions while directors, in general, listed more contributions that related to changes in degree of involvement and/or role in the project.

TABLE 11

COUNCILS' MAJOR CONTRIBUTIONS

	Special Projects	Changes in Community	Role in Project Operations
'78 Chair-persons	•Volunteer program •Volunteer program •Parenting sessions •Enrichment classes	•Increasing community involvement •Better use of resources	
'79 Chair-persons	•School visitation •Parent Information Center	•Increase community involvement •Liaison between school and community	•Input into project decisions
'78 Directors	•Leadership training for parents and volunteers •Volunteer program •Community newsletter •Community forum •Community education programs •Tutoring program •Improved playgrounds	•Informing community •Contact with community •Community awareness •Open communication with community •Increased community involvement •Increased parent awareness •Involvement of parensts	•Role in planning, implementation, and evaluation •Support of project activities •Needs assessment •Collaborative spirit between community & IHE •Input in planning and decision-making
'79 Directors	•Orientation for new students	•Community awareness •Community representation	•Support of project activities •Needs assessment •Needs assessment •Increased project awareness of community

Section IV - Factors in Council Developement.

Section IV solicited from respondents factors which had been "significant problems in the development of the council as an effective group," and descriptions of "the major problem/obstacle the council has faced." This section of the questionnaire was perhaps the most subjective part of the questionnaire, and the results need to be viewed in that light. Since "significant problem" was subject to the respondents' individual interpretations, it is somewhat difficult to generalize about the results. Close inspection of the data suggests that perhaps the respondents interpreted "significant problem" in terms of a negative experience or episode. In reality, the lack of communication or understanding may not cause any any negative experiences, but may nevertheless be a problem that prevents council development. (Complete results of Section IV are recorded in Tables 12 and 13 at the end of this section.)

The data indicates that the problems councils have experienced are diverse, with no one factor standing out as the primary problem area. Generally, there were more differences between role groups with regard to problems than between different year projects. In terms of the total group of respondents, there were only three factors which were marked by approximately half:

53% - Lack of understanding of the council's role by the council

49% - Minimal attendance at meetings

48% - Lack of understanding of the council's role by the community

Chairpersons and directors had slightly different perceptions of the most frequent problems.

Most frequent problems reported by chairpersons

55% - Lack of interest by council members

51% - Lack of understanding of council's role by the community

49% - Lack of understanding of council's role by the community council members

Most frequent problems reported by directors

58% - Lack of understanding of council's role by the community council members

56% - Minimal attendance at meetings

46% - Lack of understanding of council's role by the community

The project respondents, as a whole and by role groups, indicated that lack of understanding of the council's role by (1) the council, and by (2) the community were major problems. Yet lack of council training, which would have helped council members understand their role was marked as a problem by only 25% of the respondents. Similarly, only 25% of the respondents indicated that communication with the community was a problem. However, one would assume that if there were no problems in communication between the council and the community, there would be less problem in the community's understanding of the council's role.

Lack of interest by council members was indicated as a problem by 80% of Program '78 chairpersons. However, less than one-third of the other three subgroups considered this factor a problem. These results may be skewed by the relatively small number of Program '78 chairperson respondents. However, it is possible that this response may be a reflection of attrition and disillusionment that Program '78 councils may have experienced during their two years as "the pioneers" of community councils.

Relationships with teachers was a more frequent concern among Program '78 project personnel (especially chairpersons) than among Program '79 personnel. Sixty-one percent of Program '78 respondents indicated that teachers' understanding of the council's role was a problem, compared to only 20% of Program '79 respondents. Eighty percent of Program '78 chairpersons indicated this was a concern, and 40% of these chairpersons were concerned about communication with teachers. This may be a reflection of the fact that Program '78 projects have worked directly with teachers during the second project year of inservice training, while Program '79 projects have been in a planning year.

Generally, concerns about communication, leadership behavior, and money were marked by one-third or less of the respondents as significant problems. The fact that all three of these factors are crucial to project success, leads one to again wonder how the term "significant problem" was interpreted. Although there may have been no negative experience in these areas, a lack of communication, lack of information about monies, and inadequate leadership may all have impeded council development as suggested by the open-ended comments the respondents provided.

Perhaps a clearer picture of the problems that councils have faced emerged from the data obtained from the open-ended question in Section IV B of the questionnaire. Respondents were asked to describe "the major problem/obstacle the council has faced." Table 13 summarizes these open-ended comments in three different categories: (1) Problems Caused by Project, (2) Problems with Council Members, (3) Miscellaneous Problems. In the first category, communication problems were mentioned three times; problems with money were mentioned twice; project staff

leadership was also a concern. Although only a small percentage marked these factors as problems earlier in the questionnaire, several respondents indicated they were a major problem.

In the second category — Problems with Council Members — the most frequently mentioned concerns were those relating to: attendance at meetings (four times); lack of interest and commitment (seven times); and lack of understanding of Teacher Corps and/or the council's role and function (four times). It may well be that the lack of understanding leads to lack of interest and commitment, which may, in turn, result in poor attendance. Since these problems appear to be relatively common in council development, Teacher Corps personnel may need to look at strategies for coping with these problems.

From the perspective of role groups, chairpersons and directors generally delineated a different set of problems. Directors listed more problems with council members' attitudes, interest, and lack of knowledge. Chairpersons, however, listed more problems with other project groups. These two different perspectives perhaps demonstrate the inherent complexity in a collaborative venture — it is always easier to blame the other guy.

Total N = 34
'78 Dir. N = 14 Chr. N = 5
'79 Dir. N = 8 Chr. N = 7

TABLE 12 - FACTORS IN COUNCIL DEVELOPMENT

		Dir.	Chair.	All
1. Minimal attendance at meetings	'78	50%	40%	45%
	'79	63%	43%	53%
	All	56%	41%	49%
2. Lack of interest by council members	'78	29%	80%	55%
	'79	13%	29%	21%
	All	21%	55%	38%
3. Lack of council training	'78	22%	20%	21%
	'79	25%	29%	27%
	All	23%	24%	24%
4. Lack of understanding of council's role by:				
a. Council members	'78	65%	40%	53%
	'79	50%	58%	54%
	All	58%	49%	53%
b. Project staff	'78	8%	20%	14%
	'79	13%	0%	6%
	All	10%	10%	10%
c. Policy board	'78	15%	20%	18%
	'79	13%	0%	7%
	All	14%	10%	12%
d. Community	'78	29%	60%	44%
	'79	63%	43%	53%
	All	46%	51%	48%

FACTORS IN COUNCIL DEVELOPMENT (continued)

		Dir.	Chair.	All
4. Lack of understanding of council role by:				
e. Teachers	'78	43%	80%	61%
	'79	25%	15%	20%
	All	34%	45%	39%
5. Problems in communication:				
a. Among council members	'78	15%	0%	13%
	'79	25%	0%	7%
	All	20%	0%	10%
b. Between council and project staff	'78	22%	20%	21%
	'79	13%	43%	28%
	All	17%	31%	24%
c. Between council and policy board	'78	8%	0%	4%
	'79	38%	29%	34%
	All	23%	15%	19%
d. Between council and community	'78	29%	20%	25%
	'79	38%	15%	26%
	All	33%	17%	25%
e. Between council and teachers/administrators	'78	29%	40%	35%
	'79	25%	29%	27%
	All	27%	35%	31%
f. Between council and university staff	'78	8%	20%	14%
	'79	13%	15%	14%
	All	10%	18%	14%

		Dir.	Chair.	All
6. Problems in leadership behavior by:				
a. Project Director	'78	22%	40%	31%
	'79	13%	15%	14%
	All	19%	25%	22%
b. Community Coordinator	'78	22%	40%	31%
	'79	25%	0%	12%
	All	23%	20%	22%
c. Council Chairperson	'78	15%	0%	7%
	'79	13%	0%	6%
	All	14%	0%	7%
d. Policy Board	'78	0%	20%	10%
	'79	0%	0%	0%
	All	0%	9%	5%
e. Others	'78	8%	0%	4%
	'79	13%	43%	28%
	All	10%	21%	16%
7. Council budget:				
a. Limited monies	'78	29%	40%	34%
	'79	13%	15%	14%
	All	21%	27%	24%
b. Limited access to monies	'78	15%	60%	37%
	'79	38%	15%	26%
	All	26%	37%	31%
c. Lack of information on council	'78	22%	40%	31%
	'79	38%	43%	40%
	All	30%	42%	35%

TABLE 13 - MAJOR PROBLEMS/OBSTACLES FACED BY COUNCILS

	With Council Members	With Project	Other
'78 Chair-persons	•Getting members to work with schools	•Gaining trust between LEA and community •Getting schools to use volunteers and community resources •Misinformation about council monies •No money to carry out activities •Communication with director •Community coordinator has too many other duties •Project staff unavailable to council	
'79 Chair-persons	•Poor attendance; no commitment: getting interested people to serve	•Lack of communication •Communication, openness among LEA, IHE, and council •Lack of Training	•No awareness of community resources and needs
'78 Directors	•Personal concerns interfere with objectives •Lack of ownership of project •Lack of interest; poor attendance •Lack of interest •Deciding council's real purpose •Attendance; direction	•Acceptance by LEA •Council's relationship to school board	•Improving neighborhood communication •Involving more parents •Lack of interesting community activities •TIME •Unclear guidelines for council election
'79 Directors	•Attendance at meetings are low priority •Understanding Teacher Corps and council parameters •Understanding Teacher Corps and council role •Role definition •Won't take initiative •Inactive members		•TC/W Expectations -- "Big Brother" syndrome

Section V - Community Involvement

In Section V of the questionnaire, respondents were asked to indicate the type of community activities engaged in by their projects by checking a list of thirty-four sample activities. The results indicate that projects and councils have been involved in numerous, diverse activities, with no one type of activity dominating the list.

There were four activities in which at least half of the projects have been involved. These four include parent training courses (65%), community resource hand book (50%), publicity/media programs (50%), and parents as tutors (50%). As expected, Program '78 projects reported a higher percentage of project-sponsored community activities than Program '79 projects, probably as a result of their stage of development in the second year of the project. (Respondents from Program '79 projects indicated that many of their responses reflected activities which were in the planning stages rather than activities which had actually been carried out.) Table 14 lists the community involvement activities, with the percentage of respondents who indicated project involvement, in order of frequency.

Respondents were also asked, in an open-ended question, to describe their most successful community activities. Most of the reported activities were designed to increase community involvement in one of four ways: developing programs to assist the school and/or students; developing educational and recreational programs for the community; developing programs to assist parents; assisting the project in its operations.

There were a number of unique and creative programs listed, ranging from a "Safety Town" for children to innovative community education pro-

grams. The most frequently mentioned successful activity was a volunteer program. This is not surprising since the Teacher Corps regulations specifically require projects to develop a volunteer program. The open-ended comments indicated that projects have developed volunteer programs to meet their own specific needs, with volunteers serving as classroom or clerical aides, providing release time for teachers, and developing classroom materials. Table 15 summarizes the open-ended responses of all respondents.

TABLE 14 - COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT ACTIVITIES

	All	'78	'79
Parent Training Courses	65%	74%	54%
Community Resource Handbook	50%	64%	34%
Publicity Media Programs	50%	53%	47%
Parents As Tutors	50%	58%	40%
Development of Classroom Resources	47%	64%	27%
Increased Attendance at School Related Meetings	47%	58%	34%
Adult Education Courses (Enhancement)	47%	53%	40%
Cultural/Entertainment Events	45%	48%	40%
After School Recreation Programs	45%	48%	40%
Training of Classroom Aides	39%	37%	40%
Multicultural Events	39%	37%	40%
Extended Use of School Building	36%	37%	34%
Intern Work in Social Agencies	36%	32%	40%
Summer Reading Program	36%	43%	27%
Intern Home Visits	33%	43%	20%
Student/Parent/Teacher Forums	30%	37%	20%
Volunteer Release Time for Teachers	30%	32%	20%
Inservice Courses on Community	30%	48%	7%
Clerical Volunteers	27%	32%	20%
Community Involvement in Career Education	27%	32%	20%
Involvement of Senior Citizens	27%	37%	11%
Commun. Collaboration on Discipline Code	21%	21%	20%
Peer Tutoring	21%	21%	20%
Playground Supervision	21%	27%	11%
Adult Education Courses for Credit	18%	27%	7%

	All	'78	'79
Playground Maintenance	18%	27%	7%
Fund-Raising Activities	18%	32%	0%
Academic Recognition Awards Day	18%	21%	11%
Special Summer School Program	15%	16%	11%
Reduction of School Vandalism	12%	16%	7%
Pot Luck Suppers	12%	12%	14%
Health Fair	9%	11%	7%
Painting/Maintenance of School	0%	0%	0%
Organized Support for School Budget	0%	0%	0%

TABLE 15 - SUCCESSFUL COMMUNITY ACTIVITIES

	For Schools/Students	For Community	Parents	For Project
'78 Chair-person	•Volunteer release time for teachers •Volunteer program--aides •Fundraising activity -- basketball uniforms	•After school recreation program •Recreation program - preschoolers	•Parenting skill sessions	
'79 Chair-person	•Plan volunteer training program •Orientation for volunteers •Special summer school program	•Mini-courses for community •Speakers on special topics of interest •Special conferences		•Needs assess-ment •Intern selection
'78 Direc-tors	•School volunteer program •School volunteer program •Volunteer program -- aides, release time •Cross age tutoring program •Good Manners Day - Sr. High •"Safety Town" for students	•Extended day pro-gram for community •Community Ed. cour-ses •Recreation Program - Preschoolers •Adult English Classes [ESL] •Arts Fair	•Orientation for new parents •Organization-al skills for parents •Parent invol-vement in schools •Parenting skills workshops •Parent education •Parent visita-tion to school	•Multicultural Conference Video tape •Involvement in planning on Program Development Team
'79 Direc-tors	•Orientation for volunteers •Orientation for new students •Improve PTO's	•GED Program	•Parent infor-mation center	•Needs assessment •Needs assessment

CHAPTER SIX

SUMMARY OF RESULTS AND IMPLICATIONS

The purpose of this pilot study was two-fold: (1) to provide descriptive information about the status of Southeastern Region Teacher Corps community councils in terms of council development, operations, activities, and level of involvement in project operations; and (2) to identify areas in council development that might be appropriate for further research. It is felt that both of these objectives were met. While a great deal of information about councils was revealed through the survey, the unequal response rate from the subgroups prevents definitive conclusions from being drawn about the total group of respondents. However, a number of trends, issues, and patterns of council development have emerged from the analysis of the data. These findings have strong implications for further research.

Although 24 of the 27 projects in the Southeastern region were represented in the survey, it is not possible to automatically conclude that the results accurately describe all Southeastern projects. The results simply describe the perceptions of the 34 respondents (22 project directors, 12 council chairpersons) regarding community councils. However, it is felt that the respondents' perceptions are representative of the total population. The trends that emerged could be researched further to determine if they accurately describe all Southeastern community councils. It would also be interesting to determine whether the results are limited to the Southeast, or whether they reflect national trends in council development. This final section of this report will summarize

the most significant findings, with notations regarding the findings that have serious implications for further research.

Perhaps the most significant findings were the differences between Program '78 and Program '79 community councils. There were, of course, numerous commanalities, since both groups operate under the same regulations for the same purposes. Certain differences were to be expected, since the two groups were at different developmental stages -- i.e., Program '78 councils had completed the first year of planning and were well into the second operational year; Program '79 councils were completing the first year of planning. Yet the differences that emerged seemed to reflect more than expected developemental differences. In order to provide a proper perspective for these differences, it is first necessary to describe the commonalities, as reported by the respondents.

All councils were elected in a "community wide election." (The generally average or below average voter turn out causes one to wonder just how wide-spread the election actually was.) The average council has more women than men, more parents than non-parents, and either more black or more white members, with virtually no other ethnic representation. All councils have certain standard operating procedures. The majority of councils have received some sort of training which usually focused on orientation, council's role and function, and organizational strategies. All councils have had some degree of involvement in project governance through the policy board and project operations. Special projects and activities were common to all. All councils had faced some problems in their development, with approximately half reporting

problems in attendance and interest by council members and a lack of understanding of the council's role.

In spite of all the commonalities, close inspection of the results indicate that respondents from Program '79 projects, in comparison to Program '78 respondents, indicate a higher degree of council involvement in project operations and community activities and fewer problems in development. In a similar comparison, they reported that councils have more communication with policy boards (input and output), greater representation on project committees, and more input in project planning through conducting needs assessments and identifying community resources. Fewer Program '79 respondents indicated problems caused by lack of interest by council members or leadership problems with project staff. In short, Program '79 respondents seem to "feel better" about the council, it's role, and it's involvement than Program '78 respondents.

The question that is raised is <u>why</u>? Why do the respondents feel that Program '79 councils have been more involved and effective than Program '78 councils? Was it just a matter of profiting from the learnings of Program '78 projects? And if so, what are these learnings? Do the learnings reveal certain factors which enhance or inhibit council development?

This survey was not designed to show cause and effect. However, inspection of the results does indicate that certain factors in council development differed beteen the two Programs. The following listing of these factors, drawn from the results, are not offered in the way of conclusions. However, these factors, in terms of their relationship to the development of effective councils, may serve as a basis for further research. (The statements about Program '79 projects are all

made in comparison to Program '78 projects.)

Election and Membership

- Program '79 projects conducted council elections at a much earlier date than previous projects. Therefore, the council had the opportunity to be involved in project operations from the beginning.

- Most Program '79 councils included associate members, representing a broader segment of the project community than earlier funded projects councils.

Operations and Procedures

- Program '79 councils reported higher attendance by members and a higher percentage of "active" members.

- Program '79 councils received training earlier, usually within three months after the election.

Policy Board and Governance Issues

- Program '79 projects limited policy board membership to the dean, the superintendent, and the council chairperson, almost exclusively, thus helping to promote the concept of parity.

- Program '79 project policy boards met more frequently than policy boards in earlier funded projects.

- Most Program '79 respondents indicated greater involvement of the council in providing input to policy boards, receiving information about policy board meetings, representation on project committees, and in selection of staff and interns.

Research into these factors, as well as into the developmental stages of councils, seems crucial if Teacher Corps' commitment to parity, community involvement, and community based education is to be realized. The future success of community councils and these concepts may be dependent on knowing what works, what doesn't work, and why. Although this study can offer no definitive answers, it is felt that it provides a framework for both asking -- and answering -- these crucial questions.

Reference List

Aquino, J. Community involvement in education and teacher education: a preview and bibliography. Journal of Teacher Education, Summer 1975, XXVI (2), 181-183.

Bonney, N.E., & Crosby, J.W. Looking at Teacher Corps community council functioning. Athens, Ga.: Southeastern Recruitment and Community Technical Resource Center, University of Georgia, 1979.

Carrillo, T., Bonney, N., & White, M. Developing effective Teacher Corps community councils. Athens, Ga.: Southeastern Recruitment and Community Technical Resource Center, University of Georgia, 1979.

Davies, D. It can be done. In Teacher Corps National Conference report 1978. Omaha, Neb.: Center for Urban Education, University of Nebraska, 1979.

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Teacher Corps project development and operation. Federal Register 43 (37), Feb. 23, 1978.

Joyce, B.R. (Ed.). Involvement: a study of shared governance of teacher education. Syracuse, N.Y.: National Dissemination Center, 1978.

Powell, C., & Winecoff, L. Community-based education an historical-descriptive overview. In Three overviews of community based education. Washington, D.C.: Eastern Recruitment and Community Technical Resource Center, Howard University, 1979.

Smith, W.L. What is program '78? In Teacher Corps National Conference report, 1978. Omaha, Neb.: Center for Urban Education, University of Nebraska, 1979.

Winecoff, L., Powell, C., & Lyday, J. (Eds.). School - community council governance. Atlanta, Ga.: Southeastern Teacher Corps Network, Atlanta University, 1977.

APPENDIX

SOUTHEASTERN

Recruitment and Community
Technical Resource Center

Teacher Corps
University of Georgia
Suite 209
337 South Milledge Avenue
Athens, Georgia 30605
(404) 542-5862

memorandum

5/23/80

to: Southeastern Project Director and
Community Council Chairpersons

from: Nancy Bonney, Martha White

subject: Report on Community/Community Council Activities

Enclosed is a copy of a form we have designed to collect information about community council and community-based activities in the Southeastern Region Teacher Corps projects. In order to obtain the most comprehensive information possible, we are sending the forms to both the project director and the council chairperson. We feel that each of these persons will provide a unique perspective that will result in a more definitive description of community activities. Please take 20 minutes to complete this form and return it to our office in the enclosed envelope by June 2, 1980.

The Teacher Corps Washington Office is joining us in our request for this information. We plan to use this information in the development of a resource booklet describing community-based activities in the Southeastern Region Teacher Corps projects. Please note that the information will be summarized and will not be individually identifiable. We plan to distribute this booklet nationally and anticipate that you will receive your copy in August.

Thank you in advance for your cooperation in completing this form. If you feel you would like to share pertinent information which is not covered by the questions, please feel free to attach additional comments. Your assistance will aid us in developing a product that should be beneficial to your project, the Teacher Corps Washington staff, and Teacher Corps projects throughout the nation.

AN EQUAL OPPORTUNITY / AFFIRMATIVE ACTION INSTITUTION

DIRECTOR'S COMMUNITY COUNCIL QUESTIONNAIRE

I. COMMUNITY COUNCIL ELECTION DATA:

A. Check the appropriate response for each question regarding the *original* (1st year) election.

1. Method: _____Mail Ballot _____Convention

_____Polling Place _____Other (specify)_____

2. Planned by: _____Project Staff _____Project-appointed Election Committee

_____Temporary Council _____Policy Board _____ Combinations of these groups

3. Voter turn out: (in terms of community voting habits)

_____Very light _____Light _____Average _____Above average _____High

B. Please check the appropriate response for each question regarding additional elections.

1. Has a community wide election been held since the original election? _____Yes _____No

2. If yes, for what purpose?

_____Expansion of council _____Replacement of members

_____ Filling of expired terms _____Other

II. POLICY BOARD DATA:

A. The chairperson's role on the Policy Board is an important factor in council effectiveness. Please provide the following information about policy board composition by listing the position titles represented on the Policy Board; i.e., dean, director, etc. Names are not necessary.

Voting membership: _____

_____

_____

Non-voting membership: _____

_____

_____

B. How often is the Policy Board scheduled to meet?_____

C. How many times has the Policy Board actually met?_____

_____

D. If the Policy Board does not meet as scheduled, indicate the reason(s) why.

_____

_____

III. DESCRIPTION OF COUNCIL ACTIVITIES AND INVOLVEMENT IN PROJECT ACTIVITIES

A. Directions: For each item below, fill in the number that most accurately describes your council, using the following:

1. This is not true of our council.
2. This is somewhat true of our council.
3. This is generally true of our council.

____ The council provides input to policy board agendas.

____ The council is well-informed of policy board meetings and decisions.

____ The council has conducted a needs assessment of the community.

____ The council has representation on various project committees – i.e., planning committees, curriculum committees, etc.

____ The council has had a voice in the selection of project staff and/or interns.

____ The council has been involved in identifying community resources for the project.

____ The council has helped the project establish a volunteer program.

____ The council has helped to increase community involvement in the schools.

____ The council has undertaken special projects or activities.

____ The council has been involved in the production of a council and/or project newsletter. *If so, please attach sample(s) of newsletter.*

B. In the space below, briefly describe your perception of the council's major contribution to the project. (Use back if needed.)

IV. FACTORS IN COUNCIL DEVELOPMENT AND EFFECTIVENESS

A. Certain factors have been shown to inhibit council development and effectiveness. Please check the items below which have been significant problems in the development of your council as an effective group:

____ 1. Minimal attendance at council meetings

____ 2. Lack of interest by council members

____ 3. Lack of council training

4. Lack of understanding of council's role and function by:

____ a. Council members
____ b. Project staff
____ c. Policy board
____ d. Community
____ e. Teachers

5. Problems in communication:

____ a. Among council members
____ b. Between council and project staff
____ c. Between council and policy board
____ d. Between council and community
____ e. Between council and teachers/administrators
____ f. Between council and university personnel

6. Problems in leadership behavior by:

____ a. Project director
____ b. Community coordinator
____ c. Council chairperson
____ d. Policy board
____ e. Others

7. Council budget concerns:

____ a. Limited monies for council
____ b. Limited access to council monies
____ c. Lack of information on use of council monies

B. What do you see as the major problem/obstacle the council has faced? Why? (Use back if needed.)

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

V. COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT

A. The following list includes a variety of programs, activities, projects, and improvements which may result from increased community involvement in the schools. Please check the items in which your project has been involved.

- ____ Adult Education courses (enrichment)
- ____ Adult Education courses (for credit)
- ____ Parent training courses
- ____ Parents as tutors
- ____ Peer tutoring
- ____ Development of classroom resources/materials
- ____ Playground supervision
- ____ Playground maintenance/development
- ____ Clerical volunteers
- ____ Painting/maintenance of school building
- ____ Volunteer-release time for teachers
- ____ Involvement of senior citizens
- ____ After school recreation programs
- ____ Community involvement in career education
- ____ Summer reading programs
- ____ Health fair
- ____ Community collaboration on development of discipline code
- ____ Community resource handbook
- ____ Intern home visits
- ____ Intern work in social agencies
- ____ In-service courses on community
- ____ Training of classroom aides
- ____ Cultural/entertainment events
- ____ Multicultural activities
- ____ Fund-raising activities
- ____ Pot-luck suppers
- ____ Special summer school programs
- ____ Extended use of school building
- ____ Publicity-media programs
- ____ Academic recognition/awards day
- ____ Increased attendance at school related meetings
- ____ Organized support for school budget
- ____ Reduction of school vandalism
- ____ Student/Parent/Teacher forums (drugs, sex, alcohol, discipline, etc.)

B. In the space below, briefly describe one or two of your project's community involvement programs which you consider most successful. (You may wish to attach documentation reports or sample products.)

CHAIRPERSON'S COMMUNITY COUNCIL QUESTIONNAIRE

I. COUNCIL MEMBERSHIP:

Fill in the appropriate number in the blanks below.

A. Total number of elected members _____

1. Number of women _____ Number of men _____

2. Number of: Black _____ Hispanic _____
   White _____ Other (specify) _____

3. Number of: Parents _____ Students _____
   Non-Parents _____ Teachers _____

B. Expansion:

Check the appropriate response for each question.

1. Has the council been expanded since the original election? _____Yes _____No

2. If yes, by what method?

Appointment of Associate Members _____ Community Wide Election _____

Bylaw revision _____ Other (specify) _____

_____

C. Many councils have invited or appointed additional representatives to serve on the council as associate members. Please indicate the number of representatives from each of the following role groups that serve on your council.

Number of:

Students _____ Project staff _____

Teachers _____ School Administrators _____

Interns _____ Community agency representatives _____

Other (specify) _____

D. What changes, if any, in composition would make the council more representative?

_____

_____

II. COUNCIL OPERATIONS

A. **Meetings**

1. How often are council meetings scheduled to be held?

monthly _____ less than monthly _____ more than monthly _____

2. Approximately how many council meetings have actually been held? _____

3. Approximately what percentage of council members regularly attend meetings? _____

4. Approximately what percentage of council members can be counted on to carry out council responsibilities and activities? _____

B. **Procedures:**

Check the appropriate response for each question

1. Are written minutes recorded and distributed regularly? Yes____ No____
2. Does the council have a paid secretary or assistant? Yes____ No____
3. Does the council approve spending of its budget funds? Yes____ No____
4. Do the council members receive a copy of the council meeting agenda prior to the meeting?

   Yes____ No____
5. Does the council operate under a written set of bylaws? Yes____ No____

C. **Council Training:**

Check the appropriate response(s) for each question

1. How many training sessions has the council experienced?

   0____ 1 - 3____ 3 - 5____ 6 or more____
2. The training was paid for by funds from the:

   Council budget____ RCTR Center____

   Project budget____ Don't know____

   Other_____
3. Following the council election, training was provided within:

   3 months_____ 6 months_____ 12 months_____ 2nd year_____
4. The training was provided by the:

   Local consultant_____ Project staff_____

   RCTR Center staff_____ Other (specify)_____

   RCTR Center staff and/or consultant_____
5. Training topics included:

   ____Orientation to Teacher Corps and/or project goals

   ____Role & function of council

   ____Bylaws development

   ____Meeting skills

   ____Human relations training (group processes, etc.)

   ____Specific content areas (specify)_____

   ____Other (specify)_____

III. DESCRIPTION OF COUNCIL ACTIVITIES AND INVOLVEMENT IN PROJECT ACTIVITIES

A. Directions: For each item below, fill in the number that most accurately describes your council, using the following:

1. This is not true of our council.
2. This is somewhat true of our council.
3. This is generally true of our council.

____ The council provides input to policy board agendas.

____ The council is well-informed of policy board meetings and decisions.

____ The council has conducted a needs assessment of the community.

____ The council has representation on various project committees – i.e., planning committees, curriculum committees, etc.

____ The council has had a voice in the selection of project staff and/or interns.

____ The council has been involved in identifying community resources for the project.

____ The council has helped the project establish a volunteer program.

____ The council has helped to increase community involvement in the schools.

____ The council has undertaken special projects or activities.

____ The council has been involved in the production of a council and/or project newsletter. *If so, please attach sample(s) of newsletter.*

B. In the space below, briefly describe your perception of the council's major contribution to the project. (Use back if needed.)

IV. FACTORS IN COUNCIL DEVELOPMENT AND EFFECTIVENESS

A. Certain factors have been shown to inhibit council development and effectiveness. Please check the items below which have been significant problems in the development of your council as an effective group:

____ 1. Minimal attendance at council meetings

____ 2. Lack of interest by council members

____ 3. Lack of council training

4. Lack of understanding of council's role and function by:

____ a. Council members
____ b. Project staff
____ c. Policy board
____ d. Community
____ e. Teachers

5. Problems in communication:

____ a. Among council members
____ b. Between council and project staff
____ c. Between council and policy board
____ d. Between council and community
____ e. Between council and teachers/administrators
____ f. Between council and university personnel

6. Problems in leadership behavior by:

____ a. Project director
____ b. Community coordinator
____ c. Council chairperson
____ d. Policy board
____ e. Others

7. Council budget concerns:

____ a. Limited monies for council
____ b. Limited access to council monies
____ c. Lack of information on use of council monies

B. What do you see as the major problem/obstacle the council has faced? Why? (Use back if needed.)

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

V. COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT

A. The following list includes a variety of programs, activities, projects, and improvements which may result from increased community involvement in the schools. Please check the items in which your project has been involved.

- ____ Adult Education courses (enrichment)
- ____ Adult Education courses (for credit)
- ____ Parent training courses
- ____ Parents as tutors
- ____ Peer tutoring
- ____ Development of classroom resources/materials
- ____ Playground supervision
- ____ Playground maintenance/development
- ____ Clerical volunteers
- ____ Painting/maintenance of school building
- ____ Volunteer-release time for teachers
- ____ Involvement of senior citizens
- ____ After school recreation programs
- ____ Community involvement in career education
- ____ Summer reading programs
- ____ Health fair
- ____ Community collaboration on development of discipline code
- ____ Community resource handbook
- ____ Intern home visits
- ____ Intern work in social agencies
- ____ In-service courses on community
- ____ Training of classroom aides
- ____ Cultural/entertainment events
- ____ Multicultural activities
- ____ Fund-raising activities
- ____ Pot-luck suppers
- ____ Special summer school programs
- ____ Extended use of school building
- ____ Publicity-media programs
- ____ Academic recognition/awards day
- ____ Increased attendance at school related meetings
- ____ Organized support for school budget
- ____ Reduction of school vandalism
- ____ Student/Parent/Teacher forums (drugs, sex, alcohol, discipline, etc.)

B. In the space below, briefly describe one or two of your project's community involvement programs which you consider most successful. (You may wish to attach documentation reports or sample products.)